

REMARKS

Claims 1-12, 17-19, 22, 25 and 29 were previously cancelled. Accordingly, claims 13-16, 20, 21, 23, 24, 26-28 and 30 are pending.

Claims 13-14, 16, 20-21, 23-24, and 26-28 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US patent No. 7,076,784 (hereinafter Russell) in view of US patent No. 6,484,190 (hereinafter Cordes). Claims 14 and 26 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Russell in view of Cordes and further in view of US patent No. 7,171,468 (hereinafter Yeung). Claims 15 and 30 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Russell in view of Cordes and further in view of US patent No. 7,017,121 (hereinafter Gilkas). Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the rejections, and further requests allowance of the pending claims in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks.

Applicant fully concurs with the Examiner's belief that the prior art of record at least fails to describe or suggest the following structural and/or operational relationships of the claimed invention: "wherein said at least one logically co-equal object is graphically identified by a corresponding icon positioned adjacent to said at least one component along a common row on the display mechanism".

In response to a point raised by the Examiner in the Office Communication, and in the spirit of fostering expedited prosecution of the present application, Applicant has amended independent claims 13 and 23 to further illustrate aspects of what constitutes a logically co-equal object. For purposes of the present invention, a "logically co-equal object" refers to an object having a property to operate on the at least one component, i.e., not just on discrete parts of the component but the component itself. For example, the editor icon, shown in FIG. 5, identifies a logically co-equal object with respect to component A being that such an object is configured to operate on the entire component A, for example, via application 4. See also lines 1-13 of paragraph [0023] of the US patent application publication of the present invention.

In view of the foregoing considerations, Applicant respectfully submits that none of the applied art, singly or in combination, teaches or suggests each of the structural and/or operational

relationships of the claimed invention. Therefore, Applicant kindly requests the §103 rejections noted in the Office Communication be withdrawn.

Conclusion

It is respectfully submitted that each of the claims pending in this application recites patentable subject matter and it is further submitted that such claims comply with all statutory requirements and thus each of such claims should be allowed.

The commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any appropriate fees due in connection with this paper, including the fees specified in 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16(c), 1.17(a)(1) and 1.20(d), or credit any overpayments to Deposit Account No. 19-2179.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: April 1, 2010

By: Janet D. Hood

Janet D. Hood
Registration No. 61,142
(407) 736-4234

Siemens Corporation
Intellectual Property Department
170 Wood Avenue South
Iselin, New Jersey 08830